IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH AT HYDERABAD

HON'BLE Mr. JUSTICE R. SUBHASH REDDY

Writ Petition No.15398 of 2007

MONDAY, THE TWENTY THIRD DAY OF JULY TWO THOUSAND AND SEVEN

Between:

Miss. C.V. Harini, D/o. Mr. C.R.K. Gour,
Aged about 22 years, Student, R/o. Hyderabad.

… Petitioner

And

NTR University of Health Sciences, A.P.,
Vijayawada, represented by its
Controller / Deputy Registrar of Examinations,
And another.

… Respondents

Order:

This writ petition has been filed seeking Mandamus to direct the first respondent to revalue the answer scripts of the petitioner pertaining to the subjects of 'Medicine' and 'Surgery'.

2. In the affidavit filed in support of the writ petition, it is stated that petitioner joined M.B.B.S. course in the second respondent college in

the year 2002. She appeared for examinations of fourth year and when results were announced, she was declared failed in the aforesaid subjects. The case of the petitioner is that she has secured 65% marks in the first year, 62% marks in the second year and 60% marks in the third year. Her grievance is that though she has fared well in the fourth year examination also and was expecting good marks, respondents have not properly valued her answer scripts.

3. It is well settled that unless there is a provision for revaluation under the regulations framed by a University, the request of a candidate, who claims to have fared well in the examinations, to revalue his answer scripts, cannot be entertained. Except the petitioner's own assessment there is no other material to show that she was awarded less marks than she had expected. It is to be seen that expectation of students is not the criterion for awarding marks. It is for the examiners, who are experts in the field, to look into a particular answer and make their own assessment for awarding marks, having regard to the nature of question and the way in which the student answers it.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner fairly admits that there is no provision for revaluation in the academic regulations framed by the respondent-University. Hence, in the absence of any such provision for revaluation, no direction as sought for can be given.

5. The writ petition is devoid of merits and is accordingly dismissed. No order as to costs.

JUSTICE R. SUBHASH REDDY.

July 23, 2007
MRR